



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

other parts of the speech, to the careful consideration of any who may yet have any doubt as to the fundamental wrong out of which the whole terrible tragedy has developed.

We do not see how the position which Mr. Hoar takes as to the responsibility for the conflict can be gotten around without quibbling and perversion or ignoring of the truth. He is perfectly just in declaring that we had no right to take over the sovereignty of the country by purchase or by treaty cession against the will of the people. International law may sanction this transaction, but international law, which is still confessedly imperfect and confused, can give no righteous title against the plainest and simplest dictates of justice and right. This position the United States has practically always taken heretofore; in a number of cases, as in the matter of the right of expatriation, our government has changed international law so as to make it read more in harmony with justice.

The claim of resemblance between the case of the taking of the Philippines and that of the Louisiana territory Senator Hoar demolishes so entirely that it does not seem possible that any thoughtful person who reads his argument and takes the trouble to look up the facts can ever raise it again.

His presentation of the Monroe Doctrine is, so far as we know, the only really original contribution to the discussion of the subject which has been made in recent years. The recently disclosed John Quincy Adams memoranda, which he cites, make clear that the Doctrine originated in the principle that all just government derives its powers from the consent of the governed, and not in that of brutal self-interest. The United States made its declaration of policy through President Monroe, not in its own interests primarily, but in the interest of the newly formed republics of South America, which the Holy Alliance, in defense of the opposite monarchical principle, was seeking to reduce back to Spanish dominion. This Doctrine has been thrown to the winds in our treatment of the Philippines.

Not less thoroughgoing and impressive is Mr. Hoar's treatment of the flagrant and long-continued violation in the Philippines of the laws of war both as set forth by President Lincoln and in the recent Hague Convention; of the shamefulness of the lying and treachery used in the capture of Aguinaldo; of the certain degradation and brutalizing of men called to do, under such deadening conditions, such unjust and barbarous work as has been laid on the American forces in the attempt to subjugate the Filipinos. The contrast which he draws between the treatment of Cuba and that of the Philippines is magnificently done. The darkness of the one stands over against the light of the other in the most amazing opposition.

Senator Hoar feels sure, as he calls to memory the

lives and services of the great leaders in the cause of liberty and justice, that this Philippine problem will finally be settled right; that it cannot be settled otherwise, whatever may be attempted. But he feels, as multitudes of others feel, the humiliation and shame that have come upon the nation through its headlong violation of the fundamental laws of its existence.

It is said that this splendid oration, which is unsurpassed in its grasp and exposition of American political philosophy and morality, will not change a single vote in the Senate on the Philippine government bill. The old ideals are coolly asserted to be gone and powerless. The new philosophy of expansion by might and of commercialism with its decalogue of dollars are declared to have entire ascendancy there. This is hard to believe. But the speech has already had its influence in the country, where votes are changing faster than politicians believe. Its effect will grow and widen as time goes on. It will help mightily to recreate the country in the image and glory of its original self, stronger and wiser after it has returned from feeding among swine in a far country.

Editorial Notes.

Loubet's Visit to the Czar. President Loubet of France has once more visited the Czar of Russia, and the alliance of the two nations has again been effusively drunk over. When the French President was leaving for home he drank to the long life and glory of the valiant Russian navy," and in turn the Czar raised his glass "to the prosperity of the glorious navy of France." They had previously toasted the armies in similar terms. Now all this, from the military point of view, is very dazzling and wonderful, but from any other point of view it is childish and discreditable. It takes but little wit to see that the *entente cordiale* between the nations does not enter at all into the real life and thought and institutions of the two peoples. It is nothing more than a comradeship in arms, growing out of fear and dislike of other nations, and possibly to some extent out of aggressive tendencies which it is well known that both governments have in certain directions. There is doubtless also more or less of simple vainglory in it. Comradeship in arms is the lowest type of international friendship, if it can be called friendship at all. It is deplorable at this stage of enlightenment and moral development of the world in so many ways to see the seven leading powers of the Eastern hemisphere grouping themselves by threes and twos against one another, with their great fleets and armies threateningly in the foreground. Why have they not common sense enough to see the folly of the whole thing? They might so

easily, if they would, unite in a universal peace alliance, reduce their armaments to a minimum, and turn their attention to the social and industrial needs of their peoples, among whom their present policies have brought so much misery, unrest and anarchism. Here would be an end worthy of the visits of emperors and presidents.

E. L. Godkin. Mr. E. L. Godkin, late editor of the New York *Evening Post*, who has just died in England, was one of the most pronounced and trenchant opponents of war that this country has furnished in recent years. He hated and loathed the "savage" and "filthy" business, as he described it. He wrote as follows, about two years ago, in an article in reference to the Crimean War, which he saw in 1853: "The scenes in the trenches through which I passed that day gave me a disgust for war which, during the forty years that have since elapsed, I have never ceased to express whenever an opportunity offered. The doctrine of the inheritance of qualities, which now plays so large a part in the discussions of modern publicists concerning the course of history, inevitably suggests that the fighting instinct which lies latent in the breasts of even the most civilized peoples must be a legacy from countless generations of remote ancestors who, even after the dawn of consciousness, must have followed rapine and the murder of strangers as their daily occupation. It is in these things in reality that war consists, in spite of the efforts of the more civilized nations to disguise it by fine names, and to get God mixed up in it." Nothing distressed him more than the manner in which many clergymen have upheld and even provoked war. "To the promotion of war," he wrote in 1900, "even the clergy of our day are openly or secretly devoted. Many modern parsons are really as busily engaged in stirring up strife as was Friar Tuck, and this, in spite of the fact that they have seen civilization contending for two thousand years for existence against the spirit of war and conquest." "The worst wars in history have been caused by somebody's failure to believe the right things about the next world. There has always been a body of persons, priests, or ministers who knew exactly what was going on in the next world, and egged on the warriors to kill the people who did not believe them." "There are traces of the religious wars to-day. The Philippine war is partly religious, we are told, and a good many bishops and parsons are promoting it because it gives a good chance of converting unbelievers." He deplored the fact that "we in America have taken up the business of fighting just as the foremost men of the older world have concluded that, as a means of deciding quarrels, war is a mistake." The causes of wars he considered to be "found mainly in the education of young

people. The young man is taught that somebody is going to attack his country, and that his highest duty is to defend it;" that "the natives of every other country are possible enemies." "What our modern education needs more than aught else is the duty of keeping before the eyes of children the value of peace for nations as for men." "We have tried for centuries the plan of training our young men to be ready to kill each other; why can we not try, during one generation, the plan of training young men to do justice and love mercy?"

Statehood of Cuba. On May 20, at twelve o'clock, the government of Cuba was transferred by General Wood to Tomas Estrada Palma, the first president of the new Republic, and the island became an independent state in the sisterhood of nations, the twentieth American Republic. The event was attended by an outburst of popular enthusiasm unprecedented in the history of Cuba. Up to the last moment almost the Cubans entertained doubts whether the United States would ever let go her hold upon their country. When they saw the thing actually being done, which at one time they had serious ground to fear would never take place, their feelings of gratitude toward our country, coupled with that of national satisfaction, knew no bounds. It was the greatest moment in the history of the island. The event itself is unique in the annals of the relations of nations and peoples. The regrettable thing in connection with it is that it did not take place without the war with Spain, which must long embitter the relations of that country and this. That war was wholly needless, as President McKinley declared at the time, and as is now more and more generally recognized. It was therefore, from whatever point of view regarded, a wicked war, and it will so go down in history. But we do not wish, from this consideration, to depreciate the high character of the deed which has just been done by our government in turning over the control of the island to its own people. With this act our people, as a whole, are in most cordial sympathy. It was their wish and their demand. There are not a few — politicians mostly — who meant to have it otherwise. That their purposes have been thwarted is due to the sense of justice and honor exhibited by President Roosevelt and Governor-General Wood, and the firm stand which they have taken in insisting on the carrying out of that which was demanded by the national principles and the national honor. This deed will bind Cuba to the United States in a strong and lasting friendship, and do much to promote good government in the island, unless the virtual protectorate held by our government over the new republic shall hereafter be abused, as we have now no reason to believe will be the case.

The lesson thus given ought also to be influential throughout the whole realm of international affairs. It certainly would be, if we should be consistent with ourselves, and carry the same principles out in our relations to the Philippines. Our treatment of them will continually rise to mock us and convict us of duplicity and hypocrisy, unless we double back on our course and do the just and honorable thing. We ought to set about this without delay.

Work in Australia.

The friends of peace and humanity are carrying on a vigorous campaign in Australia. In March the second monthly public meeting of the Peace, Humanity, and Arbitration Society of Victoria, was held in the Assembly Hall, Melbourne, and presided over by Dr. Rentoul, the president of the society. The attendance was very large and many prominent citizens were present. "Messages were received from various branches and kindred societies throughout Australasia, and the proceedings were marked by much enthusiasm. A large accession of new members was recorded, and anti-war literature up to date was distributed. Resolutions were carried reaffirming the sacred right of freedom of political thought and speech, deplored the awful cost in valuable human lives and the widespread ruin and devastation caused by the present war in South Africa, and declaring that in the interests of the British Empire and of humanity a vigorous effort should be made to ensure peace by the offer of large and honorable terms (inclusive of autonomy, amnesty, and full compensation for property destroyed) to the Boer acting governments and commanders. It was also resolved that a new pamphlet should be issued on the peril of militarism and of the attempt to create a standing army for the Commonwealth of Australia, thus involving Australia perpetually in English wars."

The Triple Alliance.

It was recently announced by the Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs that the Triple Alliance will be renewed after its expiration next year. There has been in Italy strenuous opposition to its renewal, but this has not proved strong enough to prevent the government from engaging to remain in the compact. The renewal of the Alliance will impose upon Italy the continuance of financial burdens which she is poorly able to bear and which do her people great injury. The young King has been very desirous to reduce these burdens, and has probably consented very reluctantly to continue the arrangement from which his country reaps no appreciable advantage from any point of view. Many of the clearest-sighted men in the peninsula feel that it is unworthy of their country to make itself the political cat's paw of Germany.

They believe that militarism has been the great curse of the nation, and that Italy ought never to attempt to regain military prestige, but to seek leadership along social and industrial lines, in which only there is any hope of her ever attaining place again in the first rank of nations. Germany has probably been strongly influenced by the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, and has employed all her diplomatic arts to retain Italy as her positive ally. The latter has not had good sense and courage enough to resist the solicitations of her more powerful northern neighbor. She has been again unwise enough to sacrifice the real and permanent interests of her people to the glare and attractiveness of a great coalition dictated by the selfish ambitions and military haughtiness of her neighbor. The Triple Alliance has been in existence since 1883, and the renewal now determined upon will extend its life over another decade, with perhaps more pacific tendency than it has ever had before.

International Fellowship.

The one bright and encouraging thing connected with the appalling calamity which has just visited the Islands of Martinique and St. Vincent, destroying entire cities and tens of thousands of lives, has been the heroic endeavor of those near at hand to rescue those left in peril, and the immediate generous efforts at succor of the injured and starving put forth, especially by our own government and people, as the nearest and most able to help. The President, Congress, and the people have come to the rescue with a promptness and generosity worthy of unmixed admiration. There has been in recent times a large amount of this kind of interracial and international helpfulness in times of distress. To support this statement one has only to recall what was done at the time of the recent famine in India, of the famine in Russia, still further back, when a great relief expedition was sent from this country, and still earlier, when Ireland was starving. It is a most hopeful sign. It makes evident that there is already a distinct international consciousness, a real sense of brotherhood, that men feel with one another regardless of national or racial boundaries; that duty is ever widening its sphere. There has been much of this sort of feeling connected with the attitude of great numbers of people in all parts of the world toward the people of the Philippines and of South Africa. The sense of justice has been keenly wounded, but, deeper than that, there has been suffering with the unfortunate, weeping with those who have wept. This growing fellowship in suffering is one of the most effective agents which are to bring on the true unity of the world. How quickly the people of France and Great Britain, to which these Islands belong, have responded with gratitude and love! And this is true human friendship, not

in the least like that sentimental political stuff of which we hear too much. But this instinctive international generosity called out by calamities and great distress ought to rise, will gradually rise, into something higher and more permanent. It will develop into an intelligent purposive interest in and fellowship with other peoples in their prosperity, in their ordinary lives, and it will some day build a bulwark which will prevent any people from bringing calamity and woe upon another people by war or in any other way.

Cost of the War. In the statement which he had prepared to submit to the Philippines Investigation Committee, but was not allowed by the majority of the Committee to present, Mr. Edward Atkinson shows that for twenty years prior to 1897 the total annual normal expenditure of the government, including army, navy, pensions and interest on the public debt, was \$4.71 per head, or \$365,784,101 yearly. Since the outbreak of the Cuban and Philippine wars the rate has been \$6.57 per head, an increase of \$1.86 per head, or \$144,183,239 per annum. If the cost of the war in the Philippines this year up to June 30. does not fall below \$120,000,000, as is not probable, this will bring the total waste of war for five years up to \$660,000,000. Mr. Atkinson thinks that the attempt to justify this expenditure on commercial grounds is a failure. Our commerce with the Philippines has expanded to about \$3,500,000 per year at the present time, so that we are exporting to the islands at the rate of about five cents per head of our population. But the exports consist largely of whiskey, beer and supplies for the use of the army. The expansion of real commerce with the islands has been very little. For this increased expansion to five cents per head we have paid out \$1.86 per head. The cost of holding the Philippines will doubtless decrease greatly, but there is at present no prospect that the commercial profit from them will for long years, if ever, begin to pay the cost of their administration. In thus increasing our military expenses, Mr. Atkinson argues, most justly, that we are yielding a considerable part of our commercial advantage over the manufacturing states of Europe with whom we compete in the export of manufactures. Their aggregate expenditures for national purposes, on account of their great armaments, are more than double ours. The nearer we approach them in burdening ourselves with costly armaments the more certainly shall we put ourselves in danger of losing our industrial and commercial leadership. The Philippine war has been bad business, and its further results in changing our national policies is sure to be worse business still.

Lord Pauncefote. The death of Lord Pauncefote at Washington removes one of the foremost diplomatic peacemakers of the world. During his many years as British ambassador at Washington he always showed the most sincere and unreserved regard for the American people. He sought continually to strengthen the bonds of friendship between his country and ours, not as a matter of mere policy and political aggrandizement, but in the true and lasting interests of both peoples and of the world. His labors in promotion of a treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States will always be remembered to his honor. It is known that he was greatly disappointed when the treaty that he had negotiated with Mr. Olney failed of ratification by the Senate. It was one of the haunting desires of his later years to see such a treaty finally made. The general world knows little of the character of his services at the Hague Conference in 1899. He was the first to come forward in the large Committee on Arbitration and frankly propose the establishment of a permanent international tribunal of arbitration. He likewise proposed the scheme for an arbitration convention around which all the discussions of that subject centered. He also rendered an even more important service than this: to a greater degree than any other delegate, he created the spirit of conciliation and unity which made the Conference the eminent success that it was. Not only in the sessions of the Conference and of the committees, but on the many social occasions which occurred, he exhibited a fine spirit of gentleness, brotherliness and attentive regard for all persons of all nationalities that allayed suspicion, created confidence and developed in the Conference the spirit of harmony which so conspicuously marked it, particularly after its first stages. In the diplomatic incident at Washington in connection with the Spanish war Lord Pauncefote was moved entirely, we think, by a desire to prevent the war, which he felt ought to be and could be avoided, rather than by any hostility to the United States, of which he was entirely incapable. He died universally honored and loved by all who knew him, and his influence toward the general and permanent peace of the world will be an abiding force in the diplomatic field and elsewhere.

Brevities.

. . . The Interparliamentary Peace Union is to hold its Conference this coming September at Vienna, Austria, in the Senate Chamber. The Austrian government has voted a liberal subvention for the expenses of the Conference.

. . . The annual meeting of the Peace Society (London) was held on the 20th of May. At the public meeting held in the evening at the Friends' Meetinghouse, Devonshire House, addresses were made by the president, Sir Joseph W. Pease, M. P., by Miss Frances Thompson, W. F. Cobb, D. D., J. Stevens, D. D., Rev. F. Eynon Davies, W. C. Braithwaite, Esq., and others.